

# **P L A N N I N G   C O M M I S S I O N**

## **ACTION MINUTES**

**TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 2005**

Chair Gibson called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at the Twin Pines Senior and Community Center.

### **1.      ROLL CALL:**

Present, Commissioners:                  Gibson, Parsons, Frautschi, Dickenson,  
Wozniak

Absent, Commissioners:                  Horton, Long

Present, Staff:                                  Community Development Director Ewing  
(CDD), Principal Planner de Melo (PP), City Attorney Zafferano (CA),  
Recording Secretary Flores (RS)

**2.      AGENDA AMENDMENTS:**                                  None

**3.      COMMUNITY FORUM (Public Comments):**                  None

**C Long arrived at 7:03 p.m.**

#### **4. COMMISSION REORGANIZATION**

##### **4A. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair**

Chair Gibson opened the floor to nominations for Chair.

**C Frautschi nominated Kenn Parsons for the office of Chair of the Planning Commission, seconded by C Wozniak.**

**Ayes: Frautschi, Dickenson, Wozniak, Parsons, Gibson**

**Noes: None**

**Abstain: Long**

**Absent: Horton**

**C Parsons was elected to the office of Chair by a vote of 5/0/1/1.**

Chair Gibson opened the floor to nominations for Vice-Chair.

**C Frautschi nominated Bill Dickenson for the office of Vice-Chair of the Planning Commission, seconded by C. Long.**

**Ayes: Frautschi, Dickenson, Long, Wozniak, Parsons, Gibson**

**Noes:           None**

**Absent:         Horton**

**C Dickenson was elected to the office of Vice-Chair by a vote of 6/0/1.**

**5.           CONSENT CALENDAR:**

**5A.       Minutes of 2/15/05 Planning Commission Meeting**

**Motion by C Dickenson, seconded by C Frautschi, to accept the Minutes of February 15, 2005, with corrections as submitted to the Recording Secretary by Chair Gibson.**

**Ayes:           Dickenson, Frautschi, Long, Parsons, Gibson**

**Noes:           None**

**Abstain:        Wozniak**

**Absent:         Horton**

**Motion passed 5/0/1/1**

**6.           PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**6A.       PUBLIC HEARING – 2604 Read Avenue**

To consider a Single Family Design Review to add 1,256 square feet to the first and second floor of the existing single family residence for a total of 2,856 square feet that is below the zoning district permitted 3,500 square feet for this site.

(Appl. No. 2003-0124)

APN: 044-231-090; Zoned: R-1B (Single Family Residential)

CEQA Status: Categorical Exemption per Section 15301

Applicant: Amnon Levy

Owner: Noland Lewis

PP de Melo summarized the staff report, recommending approval with the Conditions of Approval as attached.

C Frautschi asked staff to clarify the existing radio poles and antennas, in order to assure that it is legal non-conforming because there seemed to be 6 different antennas on the roof of the house, and the report only deals with the 45-foot pole. PP de Melo explained that there are approximately 5 other antennas on the building ranging in height from 5 to 20 feet, which are part of a ham radio installation. The applicant has indicated that these antennas were built between 1972 and the mid-80's, prior to adoption in 1987 of the Section 25 of the ordinance that governs signal and receiving antennas. There is also a State law that gives cities a more difficult measure to regulate against ham radios as long as the height is considered a reasonable height to allow for the operation of the facility. Staff will do a building permit check to determine the status of the other 5 antennas, which would be handled through the normal course of code compliance. PP de Melo added that cities had no control over any type of signal or receiving antenna prior to 1987.

C Frautschi asked if there is irrigation in the front yard. PP de Melo deferred that question to the applicant, noting that there are minimal changes proposed to the front yard as part of the project.

C Wozniak asked for the height and square footage of the unimproved attic areas and for clarification of the standards for a one-car garage. PP de Melo agreed to check the plans regarding the attic area, and stated that the standard for a one-car parking space, whether it is covered or uncovered, is 8-1/2 x 18, and that the proposed garage is 9 x 20.

Noland Lewis, owner, was available to answer questions from the Commission. C Frautschi asked if there is a way to consolidate the menagerie of antennas. Mr. Lewis responded that it cannot be done since they are all on different frequencies. He added that they have been there since 1973 and that there have been no complaints from the neighbors. Responding again to C Frautschi, Mr. Lewis stated that there is a timed sprinkler system in the front.

Responding to C Dickenson, Mr. Lewis stated that the repeater on the roof is used by the City of Belmont and they are all licensed frequencies, adding that they received a commendation from the City of Belmont for that service.

Chair Gibson opened the public hearing. No one came forward to speak.

**MOTION: By C Frautschi, seconded by C Dickenson, to close the public hearing. Motion passed.**

Due to probable damage to the landscaping during construction and a broken sidewalk, Commissioners agreed to require that a Landscape Plan be approved prior to issuance of building permits. In addition, VC Parsons asked that a cross section be brought back if the unimproved attic area includes illegal square footage.

**MOTION: By C Frautschi, seconded by C Dickenson, approving a Single-Family Design Review for 2604 Read Avenue, with the additional conditions requiring a cross section of**

the attic space off the master bedroom and the addition of a fully articulated Landscape Plan (Appl. 2003-0124)

**Ayes:**                      **Frautschi, Dickenson, Long, Wozniak,**  
**Parsons, Gibson**

**Noes:**                      **None**

**Absent:**                    **Horton**

**Motion Passed 6/0/1**

Chair Gibson noted that the item may be appealed to the City Council within ten days.

## **6B.     PUBLIC HEARING – 900 South Road**

To consider a Single Family Design Review to construct a new 3,489 square foot Single Family residence that is below the zoning district permitted 3,500 square feet for this site.

(Appl. No. 2004-0051)

APN: 045-151-070; Zoned: R-1A (Single Family Residential)

CEQA Status: Categorical Exemption per Section 15303

Applicant: Janet Chuang

Owner: Ramin Dariani

PP de Melo summarized the staff report, noting that the property does not fall within the City's Downtown Specific Plan (DTSP) area. Staff identified

the hardscape issue as a “close call,” but believed that all the other findings could be met in the affirmative.

C Long asked for clarification of the outreach requirements by the applicant. PP de Melo replied that they are required to notify at a minimum the four adjacent property owners, most do the 300’ radius, and in this case the applicant went one half mile in terms of providing notice of a meeting to be held on August 28<sup>th</sup>. He added that staff had received no comments from anyone surrounding the site but if someone did not receive the notice then something had to be reconciled. C Long stated that he had been in contact with Steve and Kim Gonzales of South Road, who stated they were not noticed and they would certainly qualify as the closest house on the opposite side of the street, although maybe not the closest property. They were also concerned because they had come to the Planning office the previous Monday or Tuesday, and had been told that there had been no activity on this property since December and that nothing was forthcoming. He added that he lives within a half mile of the property and had not received notice about the August meeting.

C Long asked staff if they were aware that a large tree had fallen from that property across the power lines on the other side of the street, and if anyone in the City knew if drainage issues might have precipitated that. PP de Melo replied that he had not been aware of that and would check with other departments.

Jane Chuang, applicant/architect, was available to answer questions. Responding to C Frautschi’s question as to what she was hoping to achieve with the landscape plan, she stated that mostly they were going with the native drought-resistant species as they did not want to add a lot of water down through the street and the properties downhill. Also, the style of architecture is a modernized Tuscan with some Middle Eastern elements, so they were trying to pick up on that in terms of landscaping as well.

C Long asked about the decision process used in laying out the plan. Ms. Chuang responded that the driveway they are utilizing is the driveway that is there already; they were hoping not to have to re-grade the entire property

for the driveway and that before the present owner bought the property there was a house situated near the top of the existing site. They were trying to utilize the existing flat area, again to minimize the amount of grading they would have to do. Also, at an earlier meeting with staff they were informed that a detached garage in front of the house would require a Variance so they gave up on that idea. They sited the house based on the slope of the property, which was flatter near the top and in order to have the garage away from the street front and to utilize the existing driveway.

Ms. Chuang responded to questions from the Commission as follows:

- They had not considered whether the drains in the street are adequate for the run-off they might get in the event of a heavy rain, but they would be interested in considering a French drain now that it has been brought up.
  - They plan to finish the retaining walls the same color as the stucco of the house.
  - The retaining wall and driveway on the right of the property where cars are parked is actually within the subject property; they were hoping to get the plans through before dealing with the neighbor on that issue.
- Regarding outreach, they had met with the neighbors above and behind the property, and the two adjacent neighbors. Mr. Dariani, owner, added that he believed the owners of 925 had moved after the outreach meeting on August 28<sup>th</sup>, and that they had mailed a notice to everyone as far as he knew. They were there serving cold drinks on the 28<sup>th</sup> waiting for people to come by.
- They originally had a turnaround in the driveway but were told by staff to minimize the coverage so they took it out.
- They could redesign the terraces if they need to, but felt that they are about equivalent square footage to a normal party size deck; the view and the terraces just happen to be in front of the house.
- When asked if they would consider shifting the house further down the hill and reducing the length of the driveway, Ms. Chuang replied that it is a fine balance. The driveway has to curve because the slope of the lot is 25% and driveways are only allowed to be 18%, so it cannot march straight up the hill, and they need enough space at the top of that curve to be able to straighten up and get into the garage. If they bring the house forward they would need to drop it and do more grading. They went back and forth with the planners during the design, balancing the grading vs. the bulk of the house.



- If the Building Department requires a railing around the fountain for safety purposes, they could work on that.
- The retaining wall at the back of the yard is 6'.
- The gutters and scuppers are copper.

Chair Gibson opened the Public Hearing. No one came forward to speak.

**MOTION: By C Frautschi, seconded by C Long, to close the public hearing. Motion passed.**

C Long felt that the design would work to maximize the strengths of the property. He had issues about the drainage and the public notification and neighborhood outreach, and was disappointed to hear that the City's rules about a front accessory building precluded perhaps what could have been a more neat design with less hardscape.

VC Parsons agreed that it is a very attractive house but his concern was that the house did not fit on the site. He felt that they would be cutting away the hill to create a flat backyard and building major retaining walls to create back yards and terraces in front while everybody else in the neighborhood has decks that do not become hardscape and divert drainage. His recommendation would be to simplify it and get rid of some of the covered porches, big retaining walls, holes and excessive stairways, and create an elegant house that fits on the site and has a functional driveway. He would have a hard time approving the project based on the bulk, balance and grading.

C Frautschi concurred, adding that he would like to see a reduced driveway, see the house situated further down the lot, and see a reduction of the 38% hardscape. He would like to know exactly what percentage of the hardscape is taken up by the driveway. His opinion was that any time a protected tree is removed, like an oak, it should be replaced by 3 oaks, noting that there were no protected species trees incorporated into this site. He felt that

queen palms have to be used judiciously and that it was overwhelming him that at a distance you would see a border of palm trees going up the driveway. He agreed that it is a close call, but could not find on the hardscape issue.

C Wozniak stated that she liked the design in general but agreed that it did not fit on the site. She felt that there was too much stucco and was concerned about the retaining wall on the right. There is a 9' setback and if the retaining wall does come into the property she didn't know how that would work with this plan and would like to see more work done on that. She agreed that she would like to see more native trees and more trees that would keep the house looking like it was in Belmont and not kind of taken from some other place and plopped down. She would also like to see a reduction of the hardscape, and, due to the lack of a turn on the street, felt that it needs to have a good ingress and egress. She also suggested that it be scaled back a bit and would be able to vote for it if it fit more on the lot.

Responding to Chair Gibson's question as to what bearing an encroaching retaining wall would have on this application, CDD Ewing stated that if there is an encroaching retaining wall, the property owner is ostensibly responsible for its conforming to the code. They did not have the information to determine whether this is a violation or whose property it is on, but if the application remained open they would want to have that issue resolved.

C Dickenson agreed with VC Parsons that the design is nice but felt it fit more into the Hallmark neighborhood. Under Finding A of the Design Review Evaluation, the last line reads "minimize disruptions of existing public views; protect the profile of prominent ridgelines." He stated that a good portion of Belmont residents enter Belmont that way on a daily basis and believed it does fall right on the ridgeline, so could not find in the affirmative for Design Review item A. He also could not find in the affirmative for Design Review B, the building bulk and hardscape, and regarding Design Review H, felt that the adjacent property owner's possible encroachment onto the property should be resolved. If it is sitting on the subject property line it falls within this project and, as far as he was concerned, made everything null and void until the issue is resolved under Finding H.

Chair Gibson stated that he believed ridgeline issues refer to something sticking up above the line of the hillside and was not sure this was a ridgeline issue. He agreed that it is a very attractive house and one that would be prominent for people entering on Ralston but would prefer that it be back on the property, even at the expense at the hardscape. Also, if it were to be approved he would want to see a hammerhead, believing it would be a small increment of hardscape well worth it for the safety gain. He would not want to back down a long curving driveway with poor visibility into a street where people speed. Regarding the drainage question, CDD noted that it is a standard plan check item to make sure that drainage is either channeled to an acceptable public drainway or is adequately percolated on site. Chair Gibson concluded that the bulk and mass is an issue, however, if the siting were back further on the property it would be less of an issue. He was prepared to support the project as a close call.

Due to the arrival of Kim Gonzales and her subsequent request to speak, Chair Gibson entertained a motion to re-open the public hearing.

**MOTION: By C Long, seconded by C Dickenson, to re-open the public hearing. Motion passed.**

Kim Gonzales, South Road, stated that she had not been notified about the public hearing, and asked to receive notification about the property and its development in the future. She added that she stopped by the Permit Department the previous week and was told that there was nothing going on regarding this property and that the last work was something that happened in December. She was also told that there were no plans that she could look at. Her concern regarding the property is that, since it was clear cut, there has been significant run-off on her property, and there was a tree that fell and took down the power pole and hit her house. It pulled the power box off the side of her house and pulled the wires out of the wall. She was interested in seeing the plans and having an opportunity to look at the effect it is going to have on the neighborhood and whether or not they would have any concerns.

Chair Gibson asked staff for comments about notification. PP de Melo stated that they would check their list, and make certain it gets done for the next hearing. VC Parsons noted that the Public Hearing Notice was posted on the property and was in the newspaper.

**MOTION: By VC Parsons, seconded by C Dickenson, to close the public hearing. Motion passed.**

C Long stated that he would be in favor of a front accessory building and then seeking a variance for that to reduce the bulk. He would also be in of favor giving the applicant another shot at the design.

CDD Ewing discussed the issues the Commissioners need to address in order to give the applicant direction on how much change to the project will solve the problem. On the issue of hardscape and bulk, he felt that a critical issue for the applicant is if the house should be substantially redesigned to reduce bulk in some fashion or is it a matter of exterior appearance to reduce bulk through altering of architectural materials, colors, exterior design. I.e., should the building stay where it is and address hardscape, landscaping and maybe exterior materials, decks, and that sort of thing, or does the building need to be completely redesigned so that it located further down the hill, in which case an entirely new concept needs to be considered?

VC Parsons stated that his problem with the house is that it should be built on a flat lot, and they have totally altered the top of the hillside by building terraces and concrete walls to create a back yard and a terraced front yard. He felt that the additional hardscape created by the extraneous stairs and walkways would be better served in having a safe driveway. If the garage is placed further down the hill it makes it worse as far as climbing stairs to take kids to the garage and bringing groceries back and forth to the house, so he was inclined to say it would probably be better to keep the house where it is but it doesn't fit the hillside. He thought it was nice to have beautiful fountains and terraces on the front of the house but felt that they would not serve a functional house in terms of access to the house and questioned if the two sets of stairs going halfway down the driveway are really necessary to make the house functional and safe. He felt it would be

better to have a small turnaround to get the car backed out of the garage and turn around. He was not opposed to the size of the house or the style, and added that the back yard will be shadowed most of the time and will not be a very pleasant place to be.

C Long added that he did not have any objection to VC Parsons' comments and that the only reason that he was advocating a front accessory building garage was to reduce the hardscape because there would be a less paving due to a much shorter driveway. He agreed that the steps are onerous and that since it faces east it will be a cool house that's in a hole. He wasn't sure if bringing the hardscape down to where it is acceptable and then stepping the house down the hill is a tenable design, but it might be.

C Frautschi noted that it is basically a flat lot house on a hillside but had no suggestions to the applicant about what they need to do or even how they need to do their house except that it was not acceptable to him to have a house where 38% of the lot is hardscape. He went down South Road when it was raining and noticed that that area of the driveway can gather so much water it was like a river that was shooting out of the end of it. He stated that they need a building that works with the lot, that absorbs what's going to happen to it and that there is a real skill in balancing so that it is what the applicant wants but also so that it fits into the site; this design did not.

C Dickenson felt it is minimizing hardscape and the overall exposure of the plan as it is proposed, be it façade change or hardscape. It needs to soften itself and conform somewhat; it does not have to conform exactly to the houses to the left or the right but minimize the exposure because it is a prominent plot of land that has been clear cut so that it is sore spot now; whatever goes in there really should conform.

C Wozniak confirmed that she was in favor of looking at another design for this sight.

Chair Gibson stated that he was not sure there was a lot that could be done with the present siting to reduce the hardscape. A 12' driveway is required and he wanted the hammerhead, which would add a bit of hardscape. CDD Ewing added that a hammerhead could possibly allow some of the rest of the driveway to be reduced a bit.

CDD Ewing verified that what he was hearing is that this project requires a lot of work. If it comes back with these issues addressed but with the same basic plan, it would be taken under consideration by the Commission with no guarantees.

C Long added that other issues to be addressed were the encroachment, the retaining walls along the side, native drought-tolerant and heritage species trees to be added to the Landscape Plan, and neighborhood outreach that perhaps needs to be reviewed again. CDD Ewing proposed that they make sure that a new notice list is generated when the City sends out a new notice, and then they can check on the neighborhood outreach at that time. The applicant could always do another outreach, especially if there are significant changes being proposed to the project.

Responding to Ms. Chuang's questions about redesigning the terrace and driveway, Chair Gibson stated that it does not work well to get into an ad hoc design-by-committee discussion, and suggested that staff will organize what they've heard and work with her to find a new direction for this project

C Dickenson suggested that the applicant get a copy of the Design Review and interpret that in its purest form.

**MOTION: By C Long, seconded by C Dickenson, to continuing the Single Family Design**

**Review for 900 South Road to a date uncertain, based on the comments put forth earlier (Appl. 2004-0051).**

**Ayes: Long, Dickenson, Frautschi, Wozniak, Parsons, Gibson**

**Noes: None**

**Absent: Horton**

**Motion passed 6/0/1**

## **7. OLD BUSINESS**

### **7A. Safeway Code Compliance Update – 1100 El Camino Real**

PP de Melo stated that there was not much to report. The applicant has a target date within about two weeks for all the landscape parking lot plants, including those plants that were cut down adjacent to Peets coffee. There were no issues related to the other items. Staff would like to go to a once-a-month code compliance standpoint on this item instead of every meeting because he did not have much to report within the last two weeks. He was planning to put it on the agenda for the second meeting in April. By that time they should see the parking lot landscaping substantially completed and any other outstanding issues could be raised at that time.

Regarding the status of the Safeway project on Ralston and Alameda, PP de Melo stated that they are looking at either the first or second meeting in May to bring that project to the Commission.

Chair Gibson called for a break short break. Meeting resumed at 8:30 p.m.

## **8. NEW BUSINESS:**

### **8A. Review of Police Station Site Landscaping and Parking Lot Design – 1070 Sixth Avenue.**

Karl Mittelstadt, Parks and Recreation Director (PRD), summarized the staff memorandum noting that the project was brought to the Commission under the recently adopted “Protocols for Planning Commission Review of Public Projects.” He described the main components of the plan, noting that it was recommended by the Parks and Rec Commission in September followed by the City Council’s review and approval of the concept plan. The Commission’s input will be forwarded to the City Council for their consideration when they look at it for bidding purposes.

C Wozniak reported that she has two of the plants that are considered deer resistant on her property and that they have both been chewed up by the deer – *Acanthus mollis* (Bear’s Breech) and *Pittosporum tobira* (Tobira) and suggested covering them with netting if they are going to be within the deer’s mouth range. PRD Mittelstadt stated that they would not plant them if it is going to be a problem.

Discussion ensued, with comments from Commissioners and PRD Mittelstadt responding to questions as follows:

- The decision not to plant a redwood tree was a mistake; the person who drew up the plan confused it with an existing redwood.
- The parking spaces are standard size.
- C Frautschi stated that he would like to see Parks and Rec consider designating a tree as a “City Tree” that the City would put lights on over the holidays. PRD Mittelstadt responded that some of the Police Department staff has put lights on a redwood tree in the park for the past couple of years. Mr. Frautschi would like it to be formally designated as the City’s non-secular holiday tree.
- VC Parsons expressed his concern with pedestrian circulation and believed there needs to be some consideration given to how pedestrians get to City Hall without having to walk in the street or tromp through the landscaping. Mr. Mittelstadt suggested that a natural place to do it could be to bring it to a point where it matches up with the corner of the new curb at City hall.
- There are two new recycled benches being incorporated into the site.
- The new lawn is intended to be a separate area from the Meadow and its primary function is decorative and to provide an open area next to the building where people can sit on the shaded benches or on the lawn.
- The original Manor Building is intact, but they will have to determine where the windows and doors were on the Police Department side and replace them. Old doors may become windows because there is no place to go once you leave that side of the building.



- The Manor Building is a Belmont landmark and will be evaluated against the Historic Ordinance.
- Some Commissioners felt that the grass area could use another bench.
- C Dickenson expressed his strong support for the community tree and pedestrian access suggestions.
- The time frame is dependent on what happens to City Hall. Phase I is expected to be complete at the end of April, at which time they can move people around in the building, and the Police Department move is phase II, which PRD Mittelstadt estimated to be in late June or into July.
- The money for the landscaping is available in the Park Improvement Fund.
- The demolition is part of the City Hall project
- They will have to be careful how they remove the building because it is a Native American site and they want to minimize any excavation into the native soils.
- PRD Mittelstadt believed redoing the side of the Manor Building is part of the City Hall project budget, not part of the landscape budget.

Commissioners thanked PDR Mittelstadt and his staff for re-doing Patricia Wharton Park, for help in trying to get grants for Belmont Heights, and for putting the trees in across the street in the parking strip. C Parsons asked about the two trees that disappeared on Ralston at the college campus where they put ponds. PDR Mittelstadt responded that one was removed recently based on his pushing the University to take it out because it was very dangerously rotten and the other one was removed years ago.

#### **8B. Review of Fencing/Signage/Flagpole Relocation - City Hall Remodel Project - 1070 Sixth Avenue.**

CDD Ewing summarized the staff memorandum, asking the Commission to comment on three minor modifications to the City Hall project before a final determination is made.

Discussion ensued regarding the fencing plan. PRD Mittelstadt noted that police cars, motorcycles, barricades and cones will be stored behind the fence and the fence will screen these items from the park. C Long noted that he was adamant at the earlier meeting that he did not like the fence at all and felt that that side of the City Hall building should be open to allow

egress through that parking lot into the City Center. He did not see a fencing solution that he could support. PRD Mittelstadt explained that the side of the building that is now a public entrance becomes Police Department only, so there is no public entry on that side of the building, and the Sixth Avenue side of the site will have a rolling gate that is part of this project, so there is no pedestrian access through that side of the site. C Long reiterated that those are the things he objected to - not that one needed to enter the building but rather that he felt pedestrians should be able to walk through. His biggest concern is that the view of the park is lost from Sixth Avenue, and basically they are walling off Sixth Avenue in a way that he thinks is not attractive. PRD Mittelstadt commented that the landscape plan does not show any vines growing on the fence but shrubbery certainly would be planted in front of it.

VC Parsons stated that he wasn't sure why the Acting City Manager wanted to move the flagpole but his comment was that they need to think of the relationship of the flagpole to the trees in the area. CDD Ewing agreed that they will take a second look at that as there does need to be some balance with trees and the flagpole.

## **7. REPORTS, STUDIES, UPDATES AND COMMENTS**

CDD Ewing reported as follows:

- The State of the City was scheduled for the following Thursday. Reservations required.
- The Noise Ordinance Workshop was scheduled for Thursday, March 24<sup>th</sup>, from 6:30 to 8:00 p.m. at the Senior Center. They will look at some of the issues surrounding a noise control ordinance, moving from topic-specific ordinances in the Municipal Code to developing a comprehensive noise control ordinance.
- The first meeting of the Permit Efficiency Taskforce is being scheduled, probably for March 29, 30 or 31. He will send out a notice when the date is firmed up. It will be an orientation meeting to become familiar with some of the aspects of the program, and to set future dates.

- This was the last day for Brooks McNeil, Building Inspector, who will become Senior Inspector for the City of Burlingame.

Chair Gibson reported that he had a suggestion from Judy King, Chair of the Parks & Rec Committee, that we again this year forego the annual Commissioner Appreciation Dinner. VC Parsons stated that he likes the idea of getting together with other Commissioners and their families, and suggested that they have an event where everyone pays for their own dinner.

VC Parsons reported on his assignment to the Notre Dame/Belmont subcommittee, noting that on the 22<sup>nd</sup> the University has their Community Collaboration Day where the students do not go to class but go out and work on some well-meaning projects in the community. He has become involved in a project with the Community Center for Independence of the Disabled Inc., where they are working on a vegetable garden with the idea that if they can encourage their consumers to grow these gardens they might also teach them how to cook the vegetables and eat them. He added that he was willing to accept donations to purchase needed tomato cages for the project.

With the concurrence of the other Commissioners, C Frautschi thanked Warren Gibson for having been Commission Chair for not only the last year but for having stepped in when Phil Mathewson was appointed to the Council. He complimented Warren on having always been even-handed, calm and most of all for his sense of humor.

C Dickenson raised the topic of the process of public posting of notices, which seems to come up every other meeting. If a notice is not posted, he asked staff if there is legislation in place that would cause them to default to the next meeting or pull them back. CDD Ewing replied that they do not have legislation like that in place and it is a difficult issue because the State says that failure to provide notice as required by the State is not a basis for denying a project, so the State recognizes for its own rules that there is a bit of a disconnect – there's not a direct connection between successful notice and required approval or required denial for unsuccessful notice. We give

them the notice, we require that they do it, they put it up or they don't put it up and it gets taken down, blown down, it's not up for a day. It is a difficult issue because staff is not out there every moment checking. They do their best to put the notice in people's hands and to check that it is up at least once during a site visit. C Dickenson suggested that perhaps they could increase the size of the notice and use some type of trigger that the notice is posted from a start date to an end date and the applicant is responsible to keep it posted.

C Dickenson suggested that plans for the Commissioners packets could be down-sized to 11" x 14" so that they would be less cumbersome. CDD Ewing agreed to work with them however they wanted it so long as everybody got the same size. Several other Commissioners felt that reductions are too difficult to read the details; the suggestion was dropped.

C Wozniak stated that she could not read the Land Use Policy Map and was wondering if there's a way to show the streets and actual areas in readable format. CDD Ewing agreed to have it updated in a format that will be larger, in color and with the borders of the Land Use Policy Map clearly marked.

#### **8. PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF TUESDAY, MARCH 22, 2005.**

Liaison: Commissioner Dickenson

Alternate Liaison: Commissioner Gibson

#### **9. ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m. to a regular meeting on April 5, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. at Twin Pines Senior and Community Center.

---

Craig A. Ewing, AICP

Planning Commission Secretary

*Audiotapes of Planning Commission Meetings are available for review*

*in the Community Development Department*

*Please call (650) 595-7416 to schedule an appointment.*